REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-17, 19 and 20 are pending. Claim 18 was previously cancelled. Claims 1 and 11 are amended. Claims 1 and 11 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakai et al., U.S. Publication 2003/0012550;

claims 3, 4, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai et al. in view of Thier et al., U.S. Patent 5,410,644;

claims 5, 6 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai et al. in view of Windle, U.S. Patent 6,686,970;

claims 7 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai et al. in view of Peters et al., U.S. Patent 5,440,348;

claims 8, 9 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai et al. in view of Windle and Barton et al., U.S. Patent 6,233,389; and

claims 10 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai et al. in view of Chen et al., U.S. Patent 6,600,869.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amendments to Independent Claims 1 and 11

Independent claim 1 is amended herein to recite a method for effect addition within a single multimedia clip, including, *inter alia,*

*"**moving said second video clip to a second data track and keeping said first video clip in said first data track,*** wherein the beginning of said second video clip being at the specific time stamp in said second data track;

generating a first extended video clip and a second extended video clip to form an overlap according to said effect duration, wherein said overlap being between said first extended video clip extended backward from the end of said first video clip and said second extended video clip extended forward from the beginning of said second video clip".

The similar feature can be found in amended independent claim 11. Applicant respectfully submits that the amended independent claims 1 and 11 are not anticipated by Sakai et al. at least for reasons discussed below.

In the first page of Response to Argument, the Examiner asserts that in Sakai et al. "obviously, there is an overlap of a portion of A and a portion B shown in Fig. 4A...there are two video materials that are used: one taken from A and one taken from B. They are put together and overlapped." In direct contrast, however, the overlap in the present invention is formed by the first extended video clip and the second extended video clip as emphasized above, rather than the first video clip (a portion of A) and the second video clip (a portion of B). Obviously, the overlapping portions between the present invention and Sakai et al. are different. Therefore, at least for this reason, claims in the present invention are distinguishable over Sakai et al.

In addition, there is no "a first extended video clip" and "a second extended video clip" generated in Sakai et al. document. The segments X1 and X2 in Sakai et al. are formed by a portion of A and a portion of B as shown in Fig. 4E and Fig. 4F. Therefore, Sakai et al. at least has failed to disclose or teach a first extended video clip and a second extended video clip generated in the method for effect addition within a single multimedia clip as set forth in claims 1 and 11.

Furthermore, referring to Fig. 2 and Fig. 4 of the present invention, the second video clip is moved to the second data track but the first video clip is still in the first data track as set forth in amended independent claims 1 and 11. It is noted that ***only the second video clip is moved to the second data track***. However, a careful review of Sakai et al. indicates that Sakai et al. has failed to disclose or teach this feature. Paragraph [0061] of Sakai et al. reads "the operator monitors successively materials A, B, C and D shown in Fig. 4A and representing video signals recorded on the **optical disk 1**. The coded data of the operator-designated transition periods are reproduced from the optical disk 1 and stored into **memory 22** (see Fig. 4C)." Obviously, in Sakai et al., the first video clip and the second video clip are together moved to the second data track (memory 22) as shown in Fig. 4C, which is clearly different from the presently claimed feature set forth in independent claims 1 and 11.

In order for a rejection to be made under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the cited reference must teach or suggest each and every element in the claims. *See M.P.E.P. §2131; M.P.E.P. §706.02.* Accordingly, if the cited reference fails to teach or suggest one or more claimed elements, the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

At least for the reasons explained above, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of steps/elements as set forth in independent claims 1 and 11 are not disclosed by Sakai et al. Therefore, amended independent claims 1 and 11 are in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims

As argued above, Sakai et al. fail to teach or suggest each and every step/element in the independent claims 1 and 11. None of the applied references, including Thier et al., Windle, Peters et al., Barton et al. and Chen et al., taken alone or in combination cure the shortcomings of Sakai et al. Therefore all dependent claims are not made obvious by the applied references and are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

For example, claims 3, 4, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Sakai et al. in view of Thier et al. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Thier et al. is a patent regarding a video special effect system which is capable of displaying real-time 3D video images, such as television images, that have been transformed in three dimensions. The Examiner asserts that "Thier et al. disclose a video special effect by freezing a frame according to the last frame of a video clip (col. 15, lines 45 – 49 by considering a virtual video clip associated with the video segment including the frames before the frozen frame and having the frozen frame as the last frame)." However, Their et al. merely disclose frame-freeze is used to freeze a frame of video signal and signals which control various conventional effects but frame-freeze is ***not used to extend the video effect according to the last frame of the first video clip***, as set forth in the present claim. In addition, the first extended video clip in the present invention is

not a field or a frame of the video signal and signals which control various video effects shown in Thier et al. Therefore, the combination of Sakai et al. and Their et al. fails to render claims 3, 4, 13 and 14 as being obvious.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 208-4030 (direct line).

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Dated: April 2, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Paul C. Lewis
Registration No.: 43,368
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant